



Theory of Relevance

Dr. Fady A. Alholy

A.I. Publishers members (acaintpublishers@gmail.com)

Article Info.

Article history:

Received 5 October 2022

Revised 10 November 2022

Published 19 January 2023

Keywords:

Theory of relevance, Cognitive impact, communication, inferential approach.

How to cite:

F. Alholy, Theory of relevance, *Aca. Int. J. Soc. Sci. H.* 2023; 1(1) 55-62

Copyright:

This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0)

Abstract

The theory of relevance has emerged as a cognitive approach to pragmatics, and this is based on two basic principles. Human Cognition and Communicative Principle. Human cognition tends to the optimization of relevance while the core concept of cognition is geared towards an understanding of messages by explicating contents in them with the objective of providing the most suitable utterance. The communicative principle refers to human utterances creating intentions of optimum relevance. Any act of ostensive communication (Behavioral characteristic that communicates the intention to communicate) communicates the presumption of its own optimal relevance. This theory of relevance has added up several crucial theoretical concepts such as explicate,

echoic uses of language, the strength of communicated assumptions and distinctions such as decoding versus inference, explicate versus implicature, conceptual versus procedural meaning, interpretive versus descriptive uses of language, saying versus implicating) and so forth which is within the definition of natural language. This is a good move from conventional studies of Gricean and neo-Gricean theories of pragmatics confined to the cognitive framework.

Introduction to Relevance Theory

This theory was first presented by Dan Sperber and Deirdre Wilson, in the 1980s' as a theory of understanding and interpreting utterance. The degree of relevance of the utterance conveyed depends on the addressee's effort to process it. If I am communicating something to you, it is assumed that uttered information is well listened to by you and well comprehended and your effort is recognized. This depends on the way of my communication ability and the complexity of the text.

In the modern world, we are aware that our thoughts can be explicitly shared or communicated with another person using coding and decoding, defined by rules, languages, and symbols. However, human communication is not simply code-based explicitly sharing of ideas and it relies to a greater degree on inferences.

Interpretive inferences form an important role in interacting with the text of the communicated message to the audience and how the audience takes the essence of the message implicitly.

This theory of relevance has been mainly focused on two basic concepts which are referred to as Principles of Relevance. First Principle is Human Cognition. Human cognition is more focused on the maximization of relevance which is the core principle behind this theory. This concept of cognitive principle is geared towards an understanding of utterance based on the level of interpretation of the message provided by the audience or listener.

Relevance theory is the idea that the interaction involves several other components, such as context and inference, in addition to the encoding, decoding and transmission of messages, among other things in the disciplines of pragmatics and semantics. It is also known as the relevance concept. There are important basic concepts underlying this principle that are to be familiarized for a comprehensive understanding of the theory.

Ostensive Communication – Under this concept, it is emphasized that the intention to communicate is signaled through ostensive communication.

Cognitive Environment – Mutual Cognitive environment refers to mental context to the level we assume a set of facts to be true. Contextual effects – Cognitive effect in achieving the results by processing a text. Processing Effort – This refers to our level of hard work on focusing and understanding a text to achieve some good effects from it. The principle of Human Cognition emphasizes that an idea is relevant only when there is a positive cognitive effect on one or more contextual effects on that person. Therefore, it is very clear that the relevance of the idea is more responsive to its cognitive effect.

The second principle is referred to as the communicative Principle. Human utterances create expectations of optimal relevance. Every act of ostensive communication communicates the presumption of its own optimal relevance. When there is an intended message, it is assumed that there is a good flow of ideas that we can consider and accept with the existing level of thinking at an acceptable level.

In the message, we will get both explicit information as well as implicit information. Explicit information is directly derived from the text while implicit information refers to the assumptions, background information, and implied conclusions. In communicating thoughts from one person to another, there are two distinct ways that could be used. One method is, using different symbols, rules, and machine languages. In other words, coding, and decoding can be used in communication explicitly. The second method is through interpretive inferences which the listener interprets and analyses and grasps the information as received. This method is obviously not as explicit as coding and decoding but is left for implicit access to processing information.

The definition of the theory of relevance has been based on two core principles of cognitive principle and communicative principle. While the cognition principle refers to the optimization of relevance, the communication principle refers to the fact that messages or utterance directs to expectations of maximum relevance.

Dan Sperber and Deirdre focused their studies on forming the relevance theory to the second method we discussed above as interpretive inferences which are also known as implicit inferences. The main discussion and emphasis under this theory are that the receiver of the message reacts to the message by taking into consideration its relevance to utterance passed through processing the information quickly in the mind of the receiver. The concept of relevance means how communication could be effectively transferred especially how the newest information is transferred to the receiver and how the receiver grasps the information

effectively but effortlessly. This effort in conveying the message should be minimized effectively. As such, from a technical point of view relevance is referred to locating the relevance and communication in the cognitive process of the human mind. Relevance theory provides a framework for explaining the processes of human communication, why and how we attend to utterances, and how we infer meaning.

Relevance theory is a theory of communication, it is a pragmatic theory, and also it is a cognitive theory. All these theories are interrelated and interdependent on relevance theory.

The theory of Sperber and Wilson begins with the assumption of watersheds that are prototypical of Pragmatic theories, which are part and partial of the relevance theories. The existence of this theory further agreed with already drawn conclusions of previous research to state that utterances encounter implicatures. Further, they postulate the concept of manifestness which leads to utterances to the knowledge of an individual whether he understands the utterance consciously or unconsciously.

Through their findings, it was further established that people are reaching conclusions based on the evidence gathered and analysis of reasoning which is referred to as inferential communication establishing concepts of similarity by way of relevancy in the utterance in their mind. The outcome of this engagement will be paramount to reach presumptions related to the engaged interaction by both parties and they could be discussed as the relevancy of implicit messages for the communication and the level of consciousness on how economical the selected source of communication to the speaker.

The theory of relevance and its core principle is concerned, it refers to the presumption that utterances communicated to someone is grasped by the communicatee optimum relevance. As it has been established through the theory, it is obvious that the intended communication should be free of ambiguities so that the listener should understand it clearly. In otherward, even though rational assumptions are made by the receiver in grasping the communication reaches to him, it is of utmost importance that the communicator should be confident enough to pass the utterance implicitly.

The level of relevance is relative or subjective as it depends on many factors associated with the listener such as his state of understanding or the knowledge possessed at the time of utterance is communicated and or the level of his mental status at the time of utterance passing through the communication.

“Relevancy theory can be defined as an attempt to work out the details of one of [Paul] Grice’s conversational conversations [see the collaborative principle]. Although relevance theory deviates from Grice’s view of communication on several fundamental issues, the point. The main convergence between the two models is the assumption that communication (whether verbal or nonverbal) requires the ability to relate mental states to others. Sperber and Wilson do not reject the idea that communication requires the code model, but according to Sperber and Wilson, only the code model explains the first stage of processing. The linguistic form of a word that provides the listener with linguistic input, which is enriched through deductive processes to obtain the meaning of the speaker” (Sperber and Wilson, 1986).

Assumptions, utterances, and thoughts are considered as input properties within the definition of Relevance to the cognitive concept. Sperber and Wilson (1995) as pioneers of the Relevance Theory claimed that the cognitive principle and communicative principle tend to understand the principle of relevance in context to the receiver’s level of interpretation through his beliefs norms and experience which in turn matters the effective communication. Relevance is a cognitive process and usually, this is defined as assumptions, thoughts, and utterances. These properties are referred to as potential properties of inputs. Thus, relevance theory points out that linguistic/human communication is relevance driven. It could be cognitive (Contextual

effects) and Processing effort. If a positive cognitive effect is the result of the processed input, then only it is relevant to an individual

When new information is processed by us, three types of positive cognitive effect is established.

1. Contextual cognitive effect.

The contextual cognitive effect is derived using existing and new assumptions on the scenario.

2. Evidence to strengthen the assumption that is already in existence.

3. It may also, affect negatively ie, contradict and controvert the information that was held already.

Let us consider a contextual assumption ‘If the car is there, then Aruna is at home, The utterance, ‘The car is there when we reach the home would provide the contextual implication (Positive Cogenetic Effect) “Aruna is at home “

In assessing the cognitive effects, processing effort in perception, memory and interferences are considered. If this is explained with more clarity, an utterance of a complicated, complex sentence is needed more effort to grab and process than a simple version of a sentence. Therefore, always more processing effort is required for an indirect answer to a question compared to that of a direct answer to a question.

Based on the two factors discussed, the relevancy of input could be assessed as follows,

- (1) Given the other things are constant, the higher the positive cognitive effects reached by processing an input, higher the relevance of that input.

- (2) Given the other things are constant, the higher the effort required in processing an input, the lower the relevance of that input.

The comparative relevance of alternative inputs to an individual can be illustrated as follows.

Ann, one of our friends asks us who you visited us last night.

Let us assume that we visited our uncle and aunt last night.

Now let us see what alternative utterness would constitute a true and relevant answer to Ann’s question. “We visited our uncle and Aunty”, “We visited our uncle”. “We visited our uncle and aunty or if not, coconuts could have fallen on our head. The first answer is more relevant than the other two answers. The first answer involves the second answer. Hence the first answer yields the positive cognitive effect of the second utterance and more. However, it is obvious that the latter is more costly to process.

When the same amount of effort is constituted in processing alternative inputs, the more relevant input would be the one that results in more positive cognitive effects. Out of several positive cognitive effects are resulted in the processing of alternative inputs, the less costly input to be processed as it is the more relevant.

In Gricean approaches to pragmatism, the significance of context in information exchange and comprehension has not been thoroughly explored. It is a central concern in relationship theory, which raises basic queries like: How is appropriate context selected? From such a large size, how is it? Listeners limit what is meant by them based on the assumptions that are available now of utterance?

According to relationship theory, a person's cognitive factors change how they conceptualize the outside world. When I spotted a robin in my garden, I altered how I represented it because I now knew there was a robin there. According to relationship theory, a stimulus's significance increases as cognitive control over motivation increases. For example, seeing a tiger in the garden has a greater impact on perception than seeing a robin, making it a more significant stimulus. Dialogue is practically necessary given the current state of the world, which is based on interaction, communication, and interdependence between states, peoples, groups, and movements (Al-Badri, 2023).

A stimulus is more suitable the more cognitive effects it has. However, relevance can be determined in more ways than just how many impacts were caused by the stimulus. Furthermore, processing work is important. The mental exertion required to process a stimulus, according to Sperber and Wilson, is less significant.

Defining the meaning

The notion that linguistically embedded speech material typically does not really fall short of the speaker's proposal was first explored by Sperber and Wilson. In these situations, it is unclear if "what is said" refers to what Sperber said or what the words state. and Wilson for the name "assumptions" to refer to assumptions that are verbally expressed openly.

The effects of this unbounded linguistic meaning have been the center of a lot of recent research, both in adequacy theory and elsewhere. An assessment of the loose use of metaphor and euphoria in terms of the precise expansion of areas and the reduction of a concept conveyed in a word is one recent development.

Appearance

The idea of reciprocity is used in lieu of mutual knowledge in relevance theory. According to Sperber and Wilson, it is sufficient for communication to occur because the contextual presumptions required for interpretation are incompatible between the sender and the one who receives it. Embodiment is defined as follows: "Truth clears to a person at a given time if and only he is able to mentally represent it and accept its representation as true or likely true" (Sperber and Wilson 1995:39). He must be able to build these assumptions and store them in his memory, either based on what he can sense in his immediate physical surroundings or on the foundation of presumptions that are already stored in his memory.

We can conclude that these meanings within the same language as well as among its members include a common basis for the establishment of communication because Roland Barthes defines this war with both languages in society as relied on psychological, cultural, professional references, and it is difficult to communicate with others. Despite this clarification from the two authors, they did not think twice to give their theory's justification by omitting the interlocutors' level of connection.

They attacked Roland Barthes for only being able to communicate the linguistic meaning of myths and literary works. While Roland Barthes asserts that there is a constant battle between languages in every culture in his book *The Hissing of Language*. These languages are exclusive to their own speakers, so it is conceivable that they will one day all share a common language. Although there may not be a general understanding of the contents and content of this language among society, it is widely spoken and disseminated by media outlets like television, radio, and newspapers.

What is the expected level of an individual on relevance?

Our interlocutors might be unwilling or unable to produce information that would yield the most positive cognitive effects for the least processing effort (Higashimori and Wilson 1996). In light of this, Sperber and Wilson (1995) have argued that while cognition tends to be geared to the maximization of relevance, acts of ostensive communication simply create an expectation of optimal relevance. Therefore, maximum relevance is a high expectation in communication.

Therefore, the listener would process only to his level of expectance of the ostensive stimulus (Verbal utterance) effort in processing. This is the level at which his interlocutors can grab the

goals, preferences, and abilities. Optimal relevance follows, following procedure. In order to reach one's level of optimal relevance, the least effort path to be followed (Interpretive hypothesis) until the expectation of relevance is found (Carston 2002: 45)

A number of interpretive hypotheses that are compatible with the linguistic meaning of the wordings uttered arise. The least effort on the hypotheses is the approach taken by the listener. Then the listener stops at the point where he satisfactorily reaches their expectations of optimal relevance. The "Interpretive hypotheses are meant to be all-inclusive, ie not only the proposition that the speaker expects to communicate but also implicatures contextual assumptions, and attitudes intended by the speaker.

The relevance-theoretic comprehension procedure does not always be successful as sometimes misunderstanding could occur. This heuristic procedure provides an overview of how addressees view an interpretive hypothesis overtly intended by their interlocutors. Therefore, relevance theory is based on both explicators and implicatures.

An explicator is a combination of linguistically decoded wordings and pragmatic enrichment. But implicatures are assumptions resulting from pragmatic inference communicated. explicators are derived from the actual form of the text. This includes ideas which result from reference assignment, disambiguation, and enrichment. In accordance with the corresponding conventional meaning of the uttered sentence, this conceptual representation becomes a pragmatic development of the propositional schema.

In this theoretical framework of relevance, does not consider mere propositions expressed by the uttered sentence but also a high level of explicators obtained viz embedded proposition under an appropriate pro – positional attitude or speech act description (Sperber and Wilson 1993). As an example, an utterance of the sentence 'The teacher is coming' could be expressed resembling the higher-level explicators 'The communicator believes that the teacher is coming, or even 'The communicator is warning that the teacher is coming

An implicature can only be derived from the interaction of text and context. This is the second principle of relevance discussed.

We can consider these concepts of explicators and implicatures through an example as set out below.

1.A- How is Aruna feeling after his law entrance examination?

1.B- He did not get enough marks to qualify the entrance to the law college.

In the above context, A has communicated B with the following assumptions.

2.X. Aruna did not obtain cut off marks to enter to the law college. As a results, he cannot enroll for his education in the law college.

2.Y He is not feeling very happy.

2 X is an explicators of B's utterness.

2 Y is an implicature

Decoded form of B's utterance is less or more visible in 2 Y has been taken into consideration in developing propositional form template. 2 Y is totally an independent assignment inferred from 2 X. Further it relates to Aruna's failure in the performance in law entrance examination and his status of mind by the time of communicating.

The statement made in 2 X is more descriptive, elaborated, and specific than the representation encoded in 1 A. As such, depending on the context many numbers of text can be developed

Diane Blakemore (1987, 2002) conceded that linguistic meaning can encode constraints on the inferential phase of utterance comprehension. Therefore, it was recognized that there is a greater possibility that the inferential processes that describe the distinctive nature of utterance comprehension could be viewed in two ways in relevance to its linguistic meaning of it. Though most of the linguistic utterings encode elements of conceptual values, there are expressions that encode inferential procedures.

Justification in terms of conceptual encoding and procedural encoding was identified by Blakemore in both cognitive and communicative terms. A main assumption in the relevance theory is that the interpretation of utterances depends on the conceptual representations while in cognitive terms, languages encode through inferential procedures.

When we use encoding procedures to express cognitive effects from a communicative perspective, it would decrease the processing cost in achieving the effect concerned. Therefore, it is fallen in line with the communicative principles in relevance theory. For example, Blakemore (2002) links the use of the sentential connective 'but' with the cognitive effect of contradiction and elimination. For example, Ann is married to a rich person, but she is still not happy. This activates an inferential process, and the listener contradicts and eliminates the accessible assumption that wealth leads to a successful married life.

Historical research to date, in relevance theory, emphasizes the fact that interpretation of utterances is highly context sensitive. This sensitivity is not restricted to indexical expressions. Research carried out by Carston and Powell 2006; Wilson 2003, forwarded the hypothesis that lexical-pragmatic processes such as narrowing, broadenings, approximations, and metaphorical extensions are the result of a single pragmatic procedure that fine-tunes the conventional meaning of words in communication.

Further, this theory of relevance has added up several important theoretical concepts (explicators echoic uses of language, strength of communicated assumptions) and distinctions (decoding versus inference, explicators versus implicature, conceptual versus procedural meaning, interpretive versus descriptive uses of language, saying versus implicating) within the definition of natural language. This is a good move from conventional studies of Gricean and neo-Gricean theories of pragmatics confined on the cognitive framework.

This theory of relevance has a good move in understanding the semantics-pragmatics interface by arguing controversially. As a result of this, the propositional content of utterances goes far beyond disambiguation and reference assignment when it is compared to the contribution yielded by the concept of pragmatics.

The theory offers a fresh perspective on cognition in general and communication. The authors advocate the inferential approach as a substitute for the semiotic approach, which depends on both decoding and coding in communication. the opening episode. According to Sperber and Wilson "The modern history of semiotics is at the same time a mixture of institutional success and intellectual bankruptcy. On the one hand, there are now departments, institutes, societies, conferences, and periodicals all dedicated to semiotics. On the other hand, semiotics has failed to fulfill the promises it made."

Conclusion

Relevance theory was established as an advancement of social theory in the early 1980s by Dan Sperber and Deirdre Wilson. This theory has been developed throughout since then in line with the basic constructive criticism highlighted by different researchers from time to time. This paper discusses a few of the most crucial other associated theories within and as an extension of the relevance theory. Communication could be either explicitly passed through an encoding and decoding system or implicitly communicated to the listener, which will process in the mind of the receiver based on a few other factors. Hence, processing takes time and depends on many factors associated with both the communicator and the communicatee. However, the theory of relevance is focused only on the second method of communication which is context sensitive. This theory emphasizes that the cognitive principle and communicative principle tend to understand the principle of relevance in context to the

receiver's level of interpretation through his beliefs, norms, and experience which in turn matters the effective communication.

References:

1. Bezuidenhout, A. (1997) "Pragmatics, Semantic Underdetermination and the Referential/
2. Attributive Distinction," *Mind* 106: 375-409.
3. Al-Badri, Layla. The media's role in transmitting cultural dialogue. *Aca. Int. J. Soc. Sci. H.* 2023;1(1):01-05.
4. Sperber, Dan and Deirdre Wilson (1987). 'Précis of relevance: communication and cognition'. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 10: 697–754.
5. Cappelen, H. and Lepore, E. (2005) *Insensitive Semantics: A Defense of Semantic*
6. *Minimalism and Speech Act Pluralism*, Oxford: Blackwell.
7. Wilson, Deirdre (1999). 'Relevance and relevance theory'. In R. Wilson and F. Keil (eds), *MIT Encyclopaedia of the Cognitive Sciences*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. 719–22.
8. Carston, R. (2009) "The Explicit/Implicit Distinction in Pragmatics and the Limits of Explicit
9. Communication," *International Review of Pragmatics* 1 (1): 35-62.
10. Donnellan, K. (1966) "Reference and Definite Descriptions," *Philosophical Review* 75: 281-304
11. Dan Sperber and Deirdre Wilson (1986), *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. Oxford University Press,
12. Sandrine Zufferey, (2010) *Lexical Reasonability and Theory of Mind: Gaining Connections*. John Benjamins,